



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/299,952	04/26/1999	RANDALL M. GEORGE	AT9-99-174	3894

7590 09/23/2002

DUKE W YEE
CARSTENS YEE & CAHOON LLP
P O BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

NEWGEN, LILIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2156

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/299,952

Applicant(s)

GEORGE ET AL.

Examiner

Lilian Newgen

Art Unit

2156

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 April 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-11, 13, 14, 16-18, 22-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,860,012 issued to Luu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,601 issued to Matthews et al.

As to claim 1, the reference of Luu teaches of:

- **Capturing** an initial state and a modified state (**capturing** the state of the LAN Administrator's system before and after the installation of the application, col. 1, lines 66-67, col. 2, lines 1-2)
- **Modifying** (**modifies** system configuration files, col. 8, lines 5-9, instruction for **modification** of the pre-installation snapshot and post installation files, col. 6, lines 18-31).
- **Storing differences** between initial state and the modified state (**stored the differences** of the pre-installation snapshot and the post-installation snapshot in the installation package, col. 6, lines 21-33)

- **Manage configurability** (using the differences, IpackGen creates the Ipack format file, appendix A, col. 11 and col. 12, Ipack format file contains instructions to enable modification, col. 6, lines 26-33, replaceable parameters, appendix A, col. 29)

While the reference of Luu teaches of capturing the state of the system before and after the installation (col. 1, lines 66-67, col. 2, lines 1-2), it fails to explicitly teach of the initializing step. The reference of Matthew et al teaches of initializing a data processing system when the system is booted up (Fig. 6, 602, initializing, col. 2, lines 52-61, col. 6, lines 35-41) for assigning a beginning value to a variable before start up. It is obvious that the system has to be initialized before it can run. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the initializing step to Luu's invention for the purpose of starting up the computer and be able to run the programs.

As to claim 3, the reference of Luu teaches of windows-based system (windows operating system environment, col. 2, lines 65-67, col. 3, lines 1-3).

As to claim 4, the reference of Luu teaches of performing a snapshot (**snapshot** of the LAN system's administrator before and after the installation is **captured**, col. 1, lines 66-67).

As to claim 5, the reference of Luu teaches of the snapshot is **configured to include portions of data** (snapshot **contains all the information** such as the complete disk directory structure contents, copies of various systems and execution files, col. 5, lines 53-59).

As to claim 9, the reference of Luu teaches of differences between .INI files (Modified text files include *.INI files, appendix A, col. 27).

As to the method of **claim 10**, the reference of Luu inherently teaches of capturing line-by-line. It is “well-known” in the art that the capturing step has to be captured line-by-line in order to compare the files for the differences. Therefore, the step of capturing line-by-line is inherent in order to compare the differences between the files.

As to claim 22, note the discussion of claim 9 above.

As to claim 23, note the discussion of claim 10 above.

As to claim 24, note the discussion of claim 11 above.

3. Claims 2 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,860,012 issued to Luu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,601 issued to Matthews et al. as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,282,568 issued to Sondur et al.

As to the method of **claim 2**, the modified Luu’s invention fails to explicitly teach of heterogeneous client-server system. However, the reference of Sondur et al. teaches of the distribution of automated management tools that provided support for heterogeneous network environments col. 1, lines 32-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to consider implement the modified Luu’s invention in the heterogeneous environment in order to provide flexibility operation in any type of environment.

As to claim 15, note the discussion of claim 2 above.

4. Claims 6-8, 12, 19-21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,860,012 issued to Luu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,601 issued to

Matthews et al. as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,246 issued to Bahr.

As to claim 6, while the reference of Luu teaches of the differences between system files (system files are compared, col. 6, lines 21-26), user files (custom personality files replace the default personality files, col. 5, lines 30-35, personality file change after the installation, appendix A, col. 23), the modified Luu's invention fails to explicitly teach of the differences between the user registries and the system registries. The reference of Bahr teaches of the modification of the registry (registry modification service, fig. 3, 318, calls for registry modification, col. 5, lines 52-62, updating the registry on various client computers, col. 3, lines 1-15) for the purpose of centralized administration functions. It is obvious that the modification of the registry on a system also include the modification of the user registries and system registries. Thus, providing the differences between user registries and system registries. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the modification of registry to modified Luu's invention for the purpose of centralized administrative functions to provide efficiency in management of the system.

As to claim 7, the reference of Luu teaches of managing configurability of the application on a per-user basis (custom installation of application software on a user workstation, col. 5, lines 25-35).

As to claim 8, the reference of Luu does not specifically teach of managing configurability of the application on a per-system basis. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for management configuration the application on a per-system basis is "well-known" and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one

ordinary skill in the art to include managing configurability of the application on a per-system basis to Luu's invention because the system-specific changes can be applied on per machine to maintain a consistent system environment.

As to claims 12, 19 and 25, note the discussion of claim 6 above.

As to claim 20, note the discussion of claim 7 above.

As to claim 21, note the discussion of claim 8 above.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lilian Newgen whose telephone number is 703-305-7864.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Lilian Newgen
Examiner
Art Unit 2156

In
September 17, 2002


MAJID A. BANANKHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER